R E M A R K S

Claim 29 was amended so as to include the limitation of claim 46.

Claim 46 was canceled according to the above amendment of claim 29.

Claims 47, 48 and 50 were amended so as to depend from claim 29, according to the above amendment of claim 29 and cancellation of claim 46.

Claim 47 was further amended so that "silica particles prepared by a vapor deposition method" was amended to "fumed silica particles", this amendment being supported by the amendment of, for example, Page 6, lines 3-5 of the specification made in the previous response filed on August 11, 2009.

Claims 29-30, 36-37, 43-44, 46, 48-50 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al. (Kawamura, Pub. No. US2003/0068581).

Claims 31 to 33, 38 to 39 and 51 are rejected as obvious over Kawamura et al.

Kim is combined with Kawamura et al. in an obviousness rejection of claims 34 to 35; Hannah is combined for a rejection of claims 40 to 42; Namiki is combined for a rejection of claim

47; and Kurihara is combined for the rejection of claim 75.

The Examiner states that "wherein the receptive layer ([0247] wherein hydrophilic region equals to respective layer) is porous ([0247] wherein polyvinylpyrrolidone is porous see US 20090171406 in [0076] for examiner conclusion)" (bridging pages 2-3 of the outstanding Office Action).

However, paragraph [0076] of US 20090171406 teaches as follows:

(US20090171406)

[0076] The biocompatible materials include synthetic polymers in the form of hydrogels or other porous materials, e.g., permeable configurations or morphologies, such as poly-vinyl alcohol, polyvinylpyrrolidone and polyacrylamide,

According to the above disclosure, the above biocompatible materials can include "polyvinylpyrrolidone" possibly "in the form of other porous material." This does not mean that polyvinylpyrrolidone is inherently porous or porous as a certainty.

For example, an example of "a gas-tight polyvinylpyrrolidone film" (which cannot be a porous polyvinylpyrrolidone film) is

disclosed in Col. 12, lines 53-56 of **US4304838**, as follows:

> **On this coating was provided an oxygen impervious layer by overcoating a 2% aqueous solution of polyvinylpyrrolidon (molecular weight about 40,000) to give a dried thickness of about 1 micron. After an image expo-**

As described above, "the polyvinylpyrrolidone film of a dried thickness of about 1 micron" obtained by just coating a 2% aqueous solution of polyvinylpyrrolidone is "an oxygen impervious layer" which means a gas tight film and is not porous.

Thus, a polyvinylpyrrolidone film is not inherently or certainly a porous film, but itself is a dense film which can even be gas tight.

Paragraph [0247] of Kawamura (US2003/0068581) teaches as follows:

> **[0247] (2) a method in which, when a hydrophilic compound which forms a hydrophilic region has a high affinity to metallic salt like polyvinylpyrrolidone, the hydrophilic region is impregnated with metallic salt or a solution containing a metallic salt; and**

There is no disclosure nor suggestion that polyvinylpyrrolidone is porous in the above disclosure.

Accordingly, Kawamura (US2003/0068581) does not disclose nor suggest that polyvinylpyrrolidone is porous.

Further, the characteristic feature of Kawamura is that the conductive materials to form an electrical circuit is collected on the hydrophilic region by utilizing the hydrophilic nature of the surface of the hydrophilic region instead of the porous nature of the receptive layer as claimed in amended claim 29 of the present application.

Accordingly, no term "porous" is used throughout the claims and specification of Kawamura.

Combining the teaching of the secondary art with Kawamura does not render this requirement obvious.

Therefore, "the porous receptive layer" as required in claim 29 is not disclosed nor suggested by Kawamura, either alone or in combination with the teaching in the secondary art.

Claim 29 was further amended so as to include the limitation that the receptive layer contains "inorganic particles" which is the limitation according to original claim 46.

The Examiner states in the rejection of claim 46 in page 3 of the outstanding Office Action that "Kawamura shows the receptive layer ([0247]wherein hydrophilic region equals to respective layer) contains inorganic particles (see [0246]wherein respective layer is comprises by inorganic particles e.g. metal

ion)".

Although, the Examiner states that "inorganic particles e.g. metal ion", "metal ion" is a dissociated state of, for example, a salt, having a positive charge. The radius of a metal ion is, in many cases, less than 0.1 nm.

Accordingly, the metal ion of the prior art is different from the inorganic particles as claimed in amended claim 29 of the present application. Nor does it render the inorganic particles obvious.

Namiki teaches silica particles prepared by vapor deposition. This does not change the use of metal ion (not inorganic particles) of Kawamura.

Moreover, paragraphs [0242] - [0254] of Kawamura relate to the methods claimed in claims 23 and 24.

In these methods, the conductive material is a reduced metal from the metal ion and no conductive polymer impregnated in a porous receptive layer as a conductive material as required in amended claim 29 of the present application is disclosed.

Accordingly, paragraphs [0242]-[0243] cited by the Examiner disclose nothing about amended claim 29 of the present application. The secondary act is cited for a different purpose and does not render obvious this missing teaching when combined with Kawamura.

In view of the above discussion, amended claim 29 is allowable over the art.

Since the remaining claims (except claims 75 and 76) are dependent from claim 29, these claims are also allowable over Kawamura, either alone or in combination with the secondary art.

With respect to claim 76 (anticipated by Kawamura), the Examiner states that, in page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, that "[0262] wherein sodium acetate salt is inorganic particles". However, disclosed in [0262] is not "sodium acetate salt" but "a (styrene-4-sulfonyl) sodium acetate salt)" (there is no indefinite article "a" before "sodium acetate salt" but there is "a" before "(styrene-4-sulfonyl) sodium acetate salt").

The "(styrene-4-sulfonyl) sodium acetate salt" is then subjected to graft polymerization to form a polymer film from which homopolymers not subjected to graft polymerization are removed by immersing the formed film in ion-exchanged water ([0262] of Kawamura).

Accordingly, there is no disclosure of an inorganic particle contained in the polymer film of Kawamura to support the rejections.

Therefore, "a weight ratio of the inorganic particles to the hydrophilic binder is between 2 : 1 and 20 : 1" as claimed in claim 76 is not shown or suggested by Kawamura.

Accordingly, claim 76 should be allowed.

Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura et al. (Kawamura, Pub. No. US2003/0068581) of record in view of Kurihara et al. (Kurihara, US 6340443).

As discussed above, Kawamura does not disclose nor suggest a porous receptive layer of the present application.

On the other hand, Kurihara (US6340443) disclose a fine particle/polyester composition, but silent about an electrical circuit.

Accordingly, Kurihara does not disclose nor suggest a porous receptive layer of the present application.

Accordingly, claim 75 is not obvious over Kawamura and Kurihara.

Therefore, claim 75 should be allowed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the art, alone or in combination, fails to support the rejection.

Reconsideration is requested. Allowance is solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman
& Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue, 16th Fl.
New York, NY 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101
E-Mail Address: MJCHICK@FHGC-LAW.COM

Marshall J. Chick
Reg. No. 26,853

MJC/ddf